

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/812,515 | MUKAI ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Holly Rickman | 1773 | |

All Participants:

(1) Holly Rickman.

(2) Josh Snider.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 15 April 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☐ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

103 of 13 and 23

Claims discussed:

13,23

Prior art documents discussed:

none


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Exr contacted Mr Snider to discuss cancellation of claims 13 and 23 to put the case in condition for allowance. No agreement on cancellation was reached. Also discussed support for newly added limitations to "lower part" and "upper part. Exr indicated that no literal support for the recitations could be found in the specification but Fig 5 appeared to provide support. Mr snider agreed that Fig 5 was source of support for limitations..